

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DEJON DOMINIQUE DANIELS,

Defendant and Appellant.

E071203

(Super.Ct.No. FSB1500256)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Richard V. Peel,  
Judge. Affirmed.

Patricia Ihara, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant Dejon Dominique Daniels was charged by information with four counts of lewd acts upon a child (Pen. Code<sup>1</sup>, § 288, subd. (a), counts 1-4), two counts of sexual intercourse or sodomy with a child 10 years old or younger (§ 288.7, subd. (a), counts 5-6), and two counts of oral copulation or sexual penetration with a child 10 years or older (§ 288.7, subd. (b)), counts 7-8). The People moved to add another count of committing a lewd act upon a child. (§ 288, subd. (a), count 9.) Pursuant to a plea agreement, defendant pled no contest to counts 1 through 4 and 9. The parties stipulated that the police report contained a factual basis for the plea. In exchange, a trial court sentenced defendant to a total term of 16 years in state prison and dismissed the remaining counts. The court awarded a total of 1,496 days of custody credit, consisting of 1,301 actual days and 195 conduct days' credits.

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal. We affirm.

### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant was charged with, and pled no contest to, five counts of committing lewd acts upon a child. (§ 288, subd. (a).)

### ANALYSIS

Defendant appealed and, upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 , setting forth a statement of

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references will be to the Penal Code, unless otherwise noted.

the case and the following potential arguable issues: (1) whether defendant was properly advised of his constitutional rights and consequences of pleading before entering his guilty pleas; (2) whether there was a sufficient factual basis for the pleas; (3) whether defendant was sufficiently apprised of the reduced credits when he pled no contest; and (4) whether he was prejudiced by the initial error of the section 4019 credits box being checked on the plea form, but then crossed out and initialed by the court.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, which he has not done.

Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error. We have now concluded our independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

McKINSTER  
J.

We concur:

RAMIREZ  
P. J.

RAPHAEL  
J.